

London Borough of Hackney
Council
Municipal Year 2018/19
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

Minutes of the proceedings of
Council held at Hackney Town
Hall, Mare Street,
London E8 1EA

**Councillors in
Attendance:**

Mayor Philip Glanville, Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Soraya Adejare,
Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Polly Billington,
Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Jon Burke,
Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman,
Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway,
Deputy Mayor Feryal Demirci, Cllr Michael Desmond,
Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas,
Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Michelle Gregory,
Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Cllr Ned Hercock,
Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Aron Klein, Cllr Michael Levy,
Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Anna Lynch, Cllr Yvonne Maxwell,
Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Anthony McMahon,
Cllr Sem Moema, Cllr Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze,
Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr Sam Pallis, Cllr Benzion Papier,
Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Emma Plouviez,
Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Tom Rahilly,
Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Rebecca Rennison,
Cllr Caroline Selman, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Gilbert Smyth,
Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Patrick Spence, Cllr Simche Steinberger,
Cllr Jessica Webb, Cllr Carole Williams,
Cllr Caroline Woodley and Penny Wrouth

Apologies:

Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Clare Joseph and
Cllr M Can Ozsen

Officer Contact:

Tess Merrett, Governance Services

Councillor Clare Potter [Speaker] in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Joseph, Gordon and Ozsen.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Rahilly

2 Speaker's Announcements

2.1 The Speaker told Council that four Hackney residents have had recognition in the Queen's New Year Honours list. These were Sam Mullins, Jessica Kingsley, Philip Noyes, and Alicia Weston. She told Council that in her remaining four months she would be happy to act as host in showing residents around the Town Hall. Invites had been sent for the Holocaust Memorial Day 28 January at 10.00am. This was an

opportunity to reflect on what can happen when racism, hate, prejudice and propaganda were left unchallenged.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 Councillors Lufkin, Webb, Hanson, Kennedy, Snell, Coban and Race declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 11- Report of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission: Investigation into segregated cycle lanes - as members of the Ballantine Cycle campaign

3.2 Councillor Coban declared a disclosable interest in relation to agenda item 12- Motion Brexit -as an employee of My Life My Say - and left the room during consideration of that item.

3.3 Councillor Humaira Garasia declared a non-pecuniary interest as an employee of TfL.

3.4 The Speaker reminded Members that, in respect of agenda item 9, under Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, any Member who is in arrears of two or more months' Council Tax must declare it at the meeting and abstain from voting on that agenda item.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

Councillors Billington, Odze and Steinberger requested the following amendments to the minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2018:

- Paragraph 12.5 to be replaced with the following text 'I commend the ambition of the local plan but hope it can be more ambitious in line with the demands of the science. Considering the report from the International Panel on climate Change indicates we have fewer than twelve years to act to keep the world's temperature rise below 1.5 degrees, Hackney's Local Plan should be in line with this. The Greater London Authority has received independent advice which suggests as many as 300,000 heat pumps need to be installed in London by 2025 to reduce carbon emissions from heating our homes. I look forward to seeing our local plan being equally if not more ambitious as the Greater London Authority and to have concrete deliverable ways of ensuring we meet the challenge of climate change as fast as possible.'
- 'Penny' Wrout to be included in the attendance list.
- Paragraph 13.8 - to delete 'He enquired about when there would be a group director in place. Councillor Odze queried why the report did not make mention of foster care' and replace with the following words 'Councillor Odze stated there had not been enough emphasis on foster care and that it was very important.'
- Paragraph 6.7 – to delete the second sentence in the paragraph and replace with the words 'Councillor Steinberger said that back in March 2018 a woman had attended a general appointment in hospital and had taken a blood test. She was informed that she had cancer in July 2018, four months after the blood test and this in the least was very upsetting and should not have happened.'
- Paragraph 9.3 - to delete 'Alder Street' and replace with 'Oldhill Street'. To add the sentence in the sixth line of the paragraph 'Councillor Steinberger said now

you have finished damaging Oldhill Street, you are going down Dunsmure Road.'

Councillor Odze requested that future Council meetings be recorded.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 31 October 2018 be approved as a correct record subject to the above amendments.

5 Deputation

Slow Down Victoria Park Road

Councillor Wrout introduced the deputation.

Mr Romney Taylor stated that he had been a resident of Victoria Park Road for over ten years and had a young baby. His partner had been pregnant when she was almost hit by a speeding car outside their home.

Victoria Park Road had been used by motorists as a race track, commercial vehicle shortcut and had become a pollution hotspot and real danger zone. There had been a significant rise in noise nuisance for residents owing to the high volume of vehicles on this road including lorries, commercial vehicles and multiple coaches coming from Stansted at all hours of the day and night. The high volume of traffic had led to higher levels of pollution which were exceeding legal limits on this residential road and houses were vibrating from the excessive traffic.

Between 11,000 and 12,000 vehicles per day used the road to enter London via the A12 making the road unsafe and dangerous especially for children and cyclists. There had been 28 accidents on Victoria Park Road over a three-year period ending in December 2017. According to the statistics presented by the campaign group almost half of the accidents had been attributed to speeding and 93% of vehicles exceeded the 20mph speed limit on that road with minimal signage exacerbating the problem. Mr Taylor highlighted the death of Shivon Watson in 2010 who had been crushed to death in an accident involving a skip lorry on the Victoria Park Road roundabout and emphasised that immediate action was necessary to prevent any further deaths. Mr Taylor referred to a petition that had been signed by 300 people requesting the Council implement traffic calming measures to make Victoria Park Road safer for children and residents so they could enjoy clean air quality and walking.

Mr Taylor indicated that residents were seeking the following measures in their petition to improve road safety in Victoria Park Road:

1. Install measures to reduce the speeding on Victoria Park Road and keep vehicles on or below the 20mph limit e.g. speed cameras, average speed check zone, more prominent signage.
2. Add a vehicle weight restriction to Victoria Park Road to stop HGVs using it as a thoroughfare.
3. Change the layout of the road to actively stop vehicles speeding e.g. chicanes.
4. Build a cycle path to allow cyclists two-way access to the road – contra-flow cycle way.

Cllr Stops stated that one way streets had been an aspiration for a generation and supported the proposed traffic calming measures for Victoria Park Road and encouraged Members to support the motion that would to make Hackney's streets safer.

Councillor Sharman stated that as Hackney Wick Councillors they were affected by this issue and supported the need for reform. He stated that if they were interested in attending a meeting of the Community Road Watch scheme, immediate action could be taken with the community to establish the limit.

Mr Taylor responded that he welcomed the support and had discussed with Councillors and a town planning officer the different ways to approach this problem including potentially redesigning the road to allow two way traffic. He would also be interested in assisting in the scheme and reducing the number of people exceeding the speed limit.

Response to deputation

Deputy Mayor Demirci thanked Councillor Wrout and Mr Taylor for the deputation and highlighting the important issue of speeding on Hackney's roads.

She replied that Hackney Council took speeding and road safety very seriously, and continued to implement measures to make roads safer. An investigation was underway along Victoria Park Road to consider measures that would make the road safer.

At a recent meeting with Transport for London (TfL), Hackney Council had raised the issue of speeding as a serious issue, and in particular traffic coming off the A12 and into Hackney. The Council had highlighted that it was totally unacceptable that the number of road accidents had increased in Hackney, and they wanted to work with TfL to review measures to tackle this issue and contribute to its zero policy vision going forward.

With regard to the issue of speed cameras, TfL were responsible for installing street cameras and the police for monitoring them. The Council had begun liaising with TfL and the police on this issue. The Council would continue to lobby TfL on behalf of the residents to install cameras along Victoria Park Road and reported that TfL were now reviewing their criteria for speed cameras. Council officers were reviewing the signage along the entire length of the road in particular at the junction of Lauriston Road and Clermont Road where most speeding occurred and also the possibility of installing chicanes. Moreover, a review of the road was being undertaken with additional resources provided to design and implement any further measures necessary and an update would be provided within three months.

The Council would be unable to implement a vehicle weight restriction to restrict the HGVs on Victoria Park Road as this was an A-road and to ensure that HGVs did not divert and use the smaller residential side roads.

In relation to the proposal for a cycle lane, it was emphasised that Victoria Park Road was heavily used for parking and any scheme would require public consultation. However, the Council would explore with residents the possibility of a cycle lane scheme and continue to work with them to ensure any proposed measures to make the road safer were appropriate.

6.1 Question from John Anthony to the Mayor:

Referring to the unfair ban on breast stroke swimming in lane four at the Lido. A lane four swimmer can swim in lane three when this lane has most room but not vice versa. Why is there a greater likelihood of an accidental clash of heads in the latter case?

Response:

Mayor Glanville responded that since re-opening to the public in October 2006, after eighteen years of closure, the response from residents and visitors to London Fields Lido had been overwhelmingly positive, with the Lido now attracting nearly 300,000 visits annually. A wide range of swimmers accessed the swimming pool at the Lido and it was necessary to ensure that this could be done in a safe environment. Mayor Glanville stated that it was therefore decided that breaststroke would be banned from Lane 4 (the fastest lane) in 2011/12 to ensure the safety of both those using Lane 4 and those swimming breaststroke, a traditionally slower stroke. This policy was enforced by lifeguards to ensure that all users were in the correct lane, suitable for their style and speed, and was in line with industry standard guidelines.

This rule had been introduced in relation to a guideline from the Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity, guidance sheet 240. This recommended that swimmers of similar ability and stroke should use the same lane. The policy was implemented at London Fields because a particular issue had been identified, but not at other swimming pools, where the issue had not arisen. Mayor Glanville stated that since the policy had been implemented in 2011/12 Mr Anthony had extensive correspondence with the Council on this single issue, amounting to well over 50 separate responses from Greenwich Leisure Limited, Council Officers, the Council's Complaints Team, the Director of Legal and Monitoring Officer, Cabinet Members, as well as the Mayor's Office.

He said that he was satisfied that Officers and Cabinet Members had addressed all of Mr Anthony's questions and explained the policy that was in place, and had spent a lot of time and gone to great length to do so.

Mayor Glanville said that he appreciated that Mr Anthony remained dissatisfied with the ban on breast stroke swimming in Lane 4 at the Lido, but that the Council had not received any other complaints about this policy and had no plans to review it as it didn't consider it unfair. He said that Mr Anthony had received an excellent casework service throughout.

Mayor Glanville stated that this was a matter of safety and that the policy about lane swimming would remain the same. The Mayor's office centrally counted 35 separate pieces of correspondence from Mr Anthony, not including correspondence with the service, Officers, as well as correspondence with separate Cabinet Members.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

Mr Anthony stated that he had not yet received an answer to his question.

Response:

Mayor Glanville said that he would send his response to Mr Anthony.

7 Questions from Members of the Council

7.1 Question from Councillor Rathbone to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Business and Investment:

What progress is being made to help local businesses - shops and markets - to survive the current 'austerity' period following a downturn in the retail market this last Christmas, following our manifesto pledge to support our high streets and markets to thrive and prosper?

Response:

Councillor Nicholson replied that the Hackney had seen strong economic growth in the last 10 years with an increase of 61% and just under 17,000 businesses registered in the local economy. The Council had played a crucial role in bringing about the conditions to enable this growth from the planning system, promoting economic growth and providing facilities for the wider community. This had been further strengthened with the implementation of a series of Article 4 directions to remove the Government's permitted development rights that would otherwise have allowed the loss of retail and employment uses without planning permission.

The Council had protected its high streets and retail areas through the planning policy framework and the local plan, which had designated town centres and set out planning policies to support and protect retail uses within town centres. The Council's policy had encouraged and transformed the local economy and town centres making them thriving centres for communities.

The successes in Hackney's town centres were due to street markets. The Council's efforts and investment in the borough's street markets had seen this sector grow by 14 percent since last year, with an additional 455 traders operating across the borough and over 60,000 traders a year trading in Hackney street markets, which had brought an extraordinary level of footfall into the town centres. Local businesses and street traders together with Members and the Council had worked together to transform the local area and economy such as Chatsworth Road.

The Council was bringing forward a new business portal to enable local businesses to connect with the Council and to signpost businesses to a range of services such as advice and applying for business rate relief, commercial waste contracts and pest control contracts. This would help in promoting the local economy and council's ability to support the local economy and ensure that town centres remained thriving places where people could meet and trade and enterprising town centres were set to be the challenges going forward.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Rathbone stated that he welcomed the success of the street markets but there had been some misunderstanding among some locals and media that neo-liberalism gentrification was damaging the local economy.

Response:

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

Councillor Nicholson replied that the regeneration of Ridley Road market had been due to the street traders and businesses and the services and goods they offered. The inaccurate statement of neo-liberalism gentrification had arisen from confusion with an incident involving Ridley Road Village Market, which was a privately owned premises. The Council had intervened to support local businesses and tenants of that premises to ensure the tenancy contracts with the new owners preserved rents unchanged and secured tenancies for traders to continue trading.

Further, the Council had facilitated this agreement and offered alternative trading spaces for those businesses that wanted to vacate the premises, and this administration was proud of its involvement in this agreement process.

7.2 Question from Councillor Joseph to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care:

The NEU reports a projected loss of £15,283,365.06 in Hackney 2015-2020 and £610.10 in per pupil funding over the same period. Could the Deputy Mayor update us on the real impact on schools of the current funding arrangements and will the Council join the NEU in calling on the Government to properly fund schools?

Response:

Councillor Bramble thanked Councillor Joseph for raising such an important issue that affected so many children in Hackney and was a source of great anxiety and concern to parents and carers, as well as schools. The National Education Union's school funding figures compared the 2015/16 dedicated schools grant allocations with the proposed national funding formula model allocations in 2019/20. This analysis took into account official inflation figures and as a result the real scale of the significant losses for Hackney schools had become clear, which had been the opposite of what the Government was reporting. Schools were also reporting that there were bigger classes, less support staff and teachers

This model exposed the level of funding schools were losing and it was not the only model to conclude losses of funding to schools at various scales. There had been a general agreement that the financial outlook for schools was not positive and a recent analysis by the Institute for Fiscal Studies found that school spending per pupil had fallen by 8% between 2009-10 and 2017-18. This had been the largest cut in schools spending since the early 1980s. Further, the Education Policy Institute published a report in March 2018 highlighting that over 6 in 10 schools had over-spent their income in 2016/17 and were in deficit. Schools across the country were currently experiencing the first real-term cuts to spending in 20 years whilst the Government had been highlighting the recent 0.5% increase in funding for schools that fell below the pace of inflation and school costs. This funding did not cover the additional funding schools needed and did not take account of the national insurance and pension contributions and the grant cuts including Education Service and Schools Improvement grants.

The National Headteachers' Association had reported that over 80 percent of schools would be working in deficit and this deficit would be unsustainable for children. The pressure on Councils was huge and by 2020 there would be a funding gap of £7.8bn. SEND was also under pressure and the deficit was a result of inadequate funding from central government. To compound this

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

difficult position for schools, there had been huge uncertainty over the future funding arrangements for schools under the National Funding Formula. If implemented, this would significantly affect local schools. The NEU figures backed up the fact that in Hackney the situation was not much different from the rest of the country. The Council would support unions, young people and anyone that believed that education was the best start in life.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Rathbone sought confirmation that the Council would join the campaign for school funding?

Response:

Councillor Bramble indicated they would welcome the opportunity to work with the NEU and that the Mayor and Members had already spoken at rallies and in parliament on this issue and supported the view that education should be free for all not the privileged few.

7.3 Question from Councillor Billington to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs:

What progress has been made in our manifesto commitment to invest in and develop temporary accommodation for those who through no fault of their own find themselves homeless in our borough?

Response:

Councillor Rennison stated that Hackney had been at the front line of the housing crisis with 3,000 households in temporary accommodation. This was accommodation provided by the Council when homeless households came to the Council for help. That number was rising further with the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act. Wherever possible the Council sought to house homeless households within Hackney, so that they could maintain local school, work and family links. However, benefit households could pay for the cost of their accommodation but the Local Housing Allowance had been regrettably inadequate following successive cuts by Conservative governments and was not fit for purpose. This meant that increasingly the Council had to place households in hostel based accommodation from the accommodation that could be found.

The Council had been working to invest in its hostel accommodation to ensure it met an appropriate standard, with residents having access to their own kitchen and bathroom and where possible laundry facilities and wifi. This had been difficult in some of the older buildings and the Council had been refurbishing existing properties and investing in new ones working hard to keep up with the scale of demand. The Council had opened a new temporary accommodation hostel accommodating 150 households with all facilities including the internet.

This crisis had led to a human cost and financial net cost to the borough of £7m annually at a time of government funding cuts.

To place the scale of demand in context, Hackney had over 13,000 households on its housing waiting list and approximately 1000 social rent properties a year

to rent out. In the long term the Council's goal was to build enough homes in Hackney for all residents that needed them.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Billington stated that she now spoke to families with children in temporary accommodation and asked what could be done to improve the standards of this accommodation for families such as accessing digital wifi especially for children that needed it for school work and ensuring that Hackney delivered something better for its communities in spite of the cuts.

Response:

Councillor Rennison replied that the Council had been working hard to invest in its hostel accommodation to raise standards and ensure it met appropriate standards. However it had been a struggle to stay afloat owing to the scale of demand and the Council would continue to prioritise this in future. With regard to digital wifi, this had been built into the borough's digital strategy and those in temporary accommodation and hostels would be able to access it going forward. In addition, the Council had been working with Children's Services to signpost families towards support services.

The Council had made progress in improving the standards of its temporary accommodation and would continue to work towards ensuring its temporary accommodation met appropriate standards.

Practical steps were being undertaken on commissioning a framework for private sector housing. There was a need to increase the Local Housing Allowance and any pressure from the Conservative Party would be welcomed.

7.4 Question from Councillor Smyth to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Sustainability and Community Services:

What progress has been made to reduce use of single use plastics in the Council and what policies is the Council putting in place to enable residents and businesses to reduce their use of single use plastics across Hackney.

Response:

Councillor Burke replied that non-recyclable plastic and plastic waste had been contaminating farmland and waters and invading all areas such as the River Lea with devastating impact for Hackney's citizens. To address this issue structural changes were necessary at every level in society. In the Council's 2018 manifesto the current administration had signalled its intent to deal with single use plastics and had set an ambitious programme of water fountains, which was underway having secured commitment from City Hall.

Since May 2018 the Council had introduced the sustainable community strategy led by Councillor Rennison, which would use moderate spending to reduce plastic packaging and actively pursue recycled packaging and other alternatives.

The Council was successfully undertaking the extensive removal of single use plastics across the Town Hall with the potential for rapid reductions across the entire Council's premises.

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

Thus far the Council had secured removal of single use plastic cups, plastic cutlery, crockery and utensils, Hackney Service Centre cafe E-ate had been offering staff significant discounts for those using their own cups and/or lidded containers for food, external catering suppliers and internal providers were working towards being fully compliant with the Council's zero policy on single-use plastics and removal of plastics at Council catered functions and events with a few exceptions. Hackney Half-Marathon and all running events would no longer feature single use water bottles from 2019, which would considerably reduce the number of plastic bottles consumed in the borough.

Further, officers had taken the opportunity to raise awareness of waste and recycling in the borough engaging with businesses, schools and communities. They had provided residents with practical advice and actions to reduce personal plastic consumption. Businesses and other organisations had been encouraged to reduce single use plastics and fulfil their obligations in addressing this crisis.

Hackney was committed to becoming a plastic free borough and had a comprehensive strategy to deliver this commitment.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Smyth asked if the Council was liaising with the Environmental Agency to minimise the amount of plastics entering River Lea and identify where the items of plastic might be coming from in the borough.

Response:

Councillor Burke replied that the Council was responsible for some of the recycles, however, systematic removal of waste disposal facilities along the towpath had been the primary reason that plastics were going into the river and that many active community groups, CRT and the Council had expressed its concern and the Council would continue to work with CRP recycle to address this issue.

7.5 Question from Councillor Fajana Thomas to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care:

We have pledged to give all our young people the best start in life. There have been stories in the media about head teachers callously excluding and off-rolling under achieving children to make their school's results improve. Can you tell us whether this is happening in Hackney, and whether there are any statistics available in Hackney, in particular on BAMER students?

Response

Deputy Mayor Bramble stressed that Hackney Council recognised the importance of having the best education experience, from early years and into adulthood, providing a second chance to learn. The Council had started to directly address this issue last summer, working with head teachers, highlighting the focus that Ofsted was putting on this issue. Statistics for Hackney's secondary schools, for the last year 11 cohort, showed a 3% change in student numbers between start of year 10 and end of year 11. The national average was 4%. Deputy Mayor Bramble confirmed that this data was not collated by ethnicity. However, the Council was looking at disproportionality in

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

relation to young black children and in particular young black boys. She confirmed that the Council would continue this ground breaking work on improving outcomes for young black boys and men. Work in this area continued with discussions with secondary head teachers on exclusions and fair access. Advisory teams had visited relevant schools where teachers provided detailed explanations, pupil by pupil. Deputy Mayor Bramble confirmed that no evidence of unfounded off rolling had emerged. Hackney Council would continue to monitor exclusion at schools, ensuring that young people had the best educational experience, tackling any disproportionality in relation to young black boys and those children with special educational needs.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Fajana Thomas asked what monitoring mechanisms were in place.

Response

Deputy Mayor Bramble responded that a process was in place to monitor school exclusions.

(Owing to time constraints questions 7.6, 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9 were not taken at the meeting and the Speaker advised that Members would receive a written response. These responses are attached at Appendix 1.)

7.6 **Question from Councillor Patrick to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs:**

What effect is universal credit having on the residents of Hackney? What has the Council put in place to assist residents who are struggling?

7.7 **Question from Councillor Race to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care:**

The Cabinet member will have noted media coverage of a case in which a man found guilty of rape sought access to his child through the local council's care services. Can the cabinet member confirm that Hackney Council has strict policies in place that, while complying with the law, have a bias against putting children and women in a situation whereby they are contacted by the perpetrator of a crime such as this?

7.8 **Question from Councillor Hercock to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Business and Investment:**

What can the council do for the residents of Denman Court who have historically been able to access Church St via Barn Street but who are no longer able to do so since the development of new houses on Barn Street included a gated fence?

7.9 **Question from Councillor Stops to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Transport and Parks:**

The council has proposed a novel cycle scheme for the Balls Pond Road. However, Members and residents would not have been aware of the full details of the scheme because the details were either not available or not known.

Members and residents will not have known that it is proposed to introduce rubber blocks and plastic bollards into the carriageway, because the consultation said nothing of this. They would not have known the Kingsbury Road junction details, because the detailed design is not available. Bus passengers would not have known of the delays expected for buses, because nobody appears to have considered this.

Can the consultation be re-run with these details included?

8 Elected Mayor's Statement

8.1 Mayor Glanville told Council that he had spoken before about the importance of inclusive growth and that this would be at the heart of next month's budget. He said that it was firmly woven into the Council's new Local Plan, the consultation on which had recently closed. He commended the work of the planning service and Councillor Nicholson for stewarding this over the past few years. He said that the earlier debate between Councillor Nicholson and Councillor Rathbone showed the importance of that inclusive growth agenda.

8.2 Mayor Glanville stated that inclusive growth was at the heart of all the work on employment, training, and skills and the campaign on business rates that had led to the new national scheme announced in the budget, and was at the heart of the Dalston Conversation. That consultation was based on a deep commitment from this council administration to enhancing Ridley Road Market, championing diversity in Dalston, delivering more affordable work space and protecting Easter Curve Garden. It was why the Council fought for Passing Clouds, did work on the Arches and proactive action around Ridley Shopping Village, three campaigns that continued. He was pleased at the announcement that a venue was opening in Passing Clouds as a result of that action. He stated that endorsement had been received from the Mayor of London for this approach with the announcement of 'Good Growth Funding' for Ridley Road Market and the 'Creative Enterprise Zone' in Hackney Wick, building on existing Good Growth Funding. These were two Council led programmes to invest in and retain existing business communities at the heart of what, he said, made Hackney special. He said that none of this would have been possible without political and officer leadership from the Town Hall, building deep partnerships with ward councillors and local business, anchored in the community. He confirmed that the Council now had to show business growth of 61%. He went on to say that the Council was willing to go out and protest against cuts, but also work painstakingly behind the scenes as a Labour Council to win new investment and achieve real results for Hackney's communities. Over the next six months inclusive growth would be at the heart of the next budget and the work of the Commission chaired by Councillor Coban.

8.4 Mayor Glanville stated that the Council was aware that it could not deliver inclusive growth alone. This was why at Monday's Community Partnership Board, which brought together the NHS, police, business, the voluntary sector and other public sector bodies around the shared agenda, there was a real consensus in Hackney about the active use of procurement for social and environmental goals, responding to Brexit, the importance of inclusive leadership and action on poverty and inclusive growth.

8.5 Mayor Glanville said that Hackney was a proudly campaigning Council, and was united with its communities to oppose bus cuts and station ticket office closures. He

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

referred to the response to the consultation co-ordinated by Travel Watch on Overground Ticket offices and that this would hopefully be resolved. Further, TfL had reintroduced bus services on the former 277 bus route, ensuring that the borough was connected to Islington. There had been positive noises around the campaign on buses in the borough. He said that the Council believed that in the coming months there should be further positive news to announce. Mayor Glanville referred to the fact that the previous motion on Windrush had been used in Councils throughout the country. Further, there had been a victory on pay to stay, described by the Mayor as one of the last pieces of the detested Tory Housing and Planning Act.

8.6 Mayor Glanville paid tribute to Hackney's Labour assembly member Jennette Arnold who had announced that she would not be standing for the assembly next year. Jennette had served on the London Assembly for nearly 20 years, initially as a List Member in 2000 and since 2004 as member for Islington, Hackney and Waltham Forest. Throughout that time she had been a staunch advocate for the borough, standing up for the borough's diversity from 'Hope Not Hate' to 'Windrush' and was an active champion on women's issues especially FGM, modern slavery, and domestic violence. She also undertook work against knife crime in the borough. He told Council that Jennette had trained as a nurse and was proud of the NHS and her Montserrat background. Jennette was re-elected in 2016 with a majority of over 100,000. Mayor Glanville told Council that Jennette was not only a friend to him, but also to Hackney as a whole.

8.7 Mayor Glanville stated that there was much he could say on what the Council was doing for young people and families, including contextual safeguarding, the new Hackney Schools Group, the fantastic new youth parliamentarians and two Young Speakers. Before Christmas, Hanukah had been publically marked in the square for the first time.

8.8 Mayor Glanville referred to the Council's capital programme, investing in Clapton Common, De Beauvoir, Far Eastern Communities, Britannia Planning permission, new homes, repairing our schools. He referred to the expansion of SEND provision at Queensbridge School. He told Council that the Council's first Community Parklets had been introduced.

8.9 Mayor Glanville stressed the importance of tackling London's toxic air, with 9,000 premature deaths in capital alone. He told Council that this was a crucial part of the manifesto that the party was elected on and a top priority for both the Mayor of London and himself. He said that this was a public health emergency which hit the poorest, the old and young the most. More and more residents were contacting the Council about it, yet less than a third of Hackney's residents owned a car. He confirmed that the Council stood with the Mayor on this and looked forward to the launch of the ULEZ in April and the Hackney backed expansion to the North and South circular in October 2021. He considered that it should cover all of London in the future. The first of April would also be the day where the Council switch 50% of the Council's electricity to renewables and 10 % biogas in Hackney's gas mix. He outlined details of work undertaken by the Council on air pollution:

- Pioneered the first School streets in England delivered five with two more announced this month.
- First Emissions Based Permit System in our CPZs.
- The Zero Emission Network which is now being expanded to Hackney Central and we hope beyond to SN

- Our Low Emissions Neighbourhood in Shoreditch
- Schools Air Quality Project.
- A third of our fleet switched to low emission vehicles.
- Expanding our electric charging network
- Leadership from Deputy Mayor Demirci and this Council not just being recognised in London, but nationally and internationally.

8.10 Mayor Glanville asked about the Conservative Party's position on these issues. He said that at every level they opposed action, opposing road closures, opposing sustainable transport initiatives and in Shaun Bailey, their gaff prone Tory candidate for Mayor, they have chosen polluting cars and vans over Hackney's children's lungs, no doubt ably supported by the proudly diesel driving colleagues opposite. He said that this was a disgrace and that over the course of the year the Labour Party would continue to call the conservatives out on it. He said that he was in no doubt that next month there would be a cobbled together budget attacking the very interventions the Council is making to improve the borough's air.

8.11 Mayor Glanville confirmed that the Council will undertake further work in relation to reducing plastics.

8.12 Mayor Glanville stated that the impact of austerity was clear with a £140 million cut in funding since 2010 - £512 for every Hackney resident. That was the context of the preparation of the Budget. Mayor Glanville stated that he had referenced next month's budget, and was sure that the party opposite were busy on their detailed plans to cut services even further. But there was an even greater threat to the Council than the conservative party's budget fumbling, and that was the national Fair Funding Review, as if the £20-30m of cuts to our budget over the next three years weren't enough, nor cuts to SEND and education as articulated by Deputy Mayor Bramble. The Mayor stated that 'Fair Funding Review Consultation' was now underway, which he considered was a very unwanted gift for local government by Tory Whitehall trying to hide it when no one is looking. It built on the tried and tested Orwellian language of affordable rents, spare room subsidy, universal credit, right to rent, starter homes, work programme. Mayor Glanville said that there was nothing fair nor any additional funding in this review for local government. As it was currently framed it was an attack on Hackney and other deprived communities and the services they need, as well as the Councils that represent them. Rather than truly ending austerity, recognising rising need, he said that it was the same old ideological Tories, looking to shrink the Local Government cake even further; pitting communities across the country against each other for the crumbs and potentially extending austerity in Hackney well into the next decade. It proposed that a third of local government funding would no longer be weighted by poverty, deprivation, population density and socio-economic factors such as unemployment. Instead only population would be used to allocate the funding. He said that the proposal was based on less than robust evidence, was illogical and fundamentally unfair. He considered that the proposals were clearly politically motivated as they would shift money away from urban areas, particularly deprived inner-city, already hardest hit by austerity to protect Tory councils and voters from further spending cuts at the expense of deprived areas. He said it was a travesty that this protection and propping up would be paid for by the poorest and most deprived areas that needed the funding the most. Mayor Glanville confirmed that the Council would resolutely fight these proposals and he hoped that the Conservative party in their response would clearly say that they opposed this attack on Hackney.

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

8.13 Mayor Glanville told Council that he and others had very vividly seen the impact of Tory austerity when they went out to see rough sleepers at end of November. He asked councillors, on leaving, to join himself, Councillor Rennison and Councillor Selman in making a donation on 'tap london'. This was a small step to support rough sleepers.

8.14 Mayor Glanville echoed the words of the Speaker about Holocaust Memorial Day on Monday. He said that with continuing attacks on diversity and a rise in hate around the world, this was sadly a timely opportunity to reflect, remember and commit to fight hate in all its forms and in the spirit of this year's theme remember those torn from home not only in the past, but today.

8.15 Councillor Steinberger referred Council to residents who had received OBEs and MBEs together with Harry Kane, Captain of the England Football team. He welcomed Gordon Bell, freeman of the borough to the meeting. Councillor Steinberger went on to send his condolences to ex-councillor Stauber who had recently lost his wife. He referred to Mr Sills's question from a member of the public relating to homelessness and rough sleepers. He said it was different from Councillor Billington's question and expressed concern that this question had not been asked and asked that it be responded to or submitted to the next council meeting. He told Council that representatives of the Jewish Community had been invited to Downing Street on Hannukah. Councillor Steinberger told Council that some changes had been made to Universal Credit in that there would be entitlement to an additional amount for any child born before 6 April 2017. He described this as a step in the right direction. He stressed that Jewish people cannot attend events on Saturdays. He asked for increased engagement with the Jewish councillors on the Hannukah event as few Jewish people had attended. Councillor Steinberger congratulated the Government for waving the £65 fee for EU residents wishing to stay in the UK following Brexit. He expressed concerns that £34,000 had recently been written off on parking fines and expressed concern that a disabled resident had been fined and received no response from the Council on this issue. He considered that the scheme on Oldhill road was not necessary.

8.16 Mayor Glanville responded that he too was a fan of Tottenham and echoed what Councillor Steinberger said about the honour. He confirmed that he would send condolences to ex-councillor Stauber. He expressed concern that on the evening of increasing allowances, Councillor Levy was absent. He said that the Council would stand by Sir Rodney Brookes's proposed changes to the allowance scheme. He considered that the lack of Conservative leadership in the chamber was reflected nationally. The party had the opportunity to show the people of Hackney their commitment on air pollution, plastics, austerity and cuts to SEND and education funding, etc. and had not done so. Mayor Glanville referred to the fact that there had been minor movement to the Universal Credit, which was welcomed, but that this was no substitute for proper reform and proper funding for a system that had caused misery and deaths around the country. He stated that the issue around parking fines over Christmas and New Year period had been addressed. Mayor Glanville told Council that the initiatives on air pollution on Oldhill Street were necessary for the protection of children and school safety and that it was not acceptable to force children to go out the back entrance. He confirmed that he was willing to work with Councillor Burke and the Recycling Team to review recycling centres in the borough. In regard to the Hannukah event, he confirmed, that invites had been sent to key figures in the community and that he had attended and that there had been a fantastic response.

and stressed that there was not just one Jewish community and the need for inclusivity. Mums and children had spoken to him about work he had done in the community. He concluded by saying that he wanted to recognise the contribution of the Jewish community in the borough.

9 Report from Cabinet: Calculation of Council Tax Base and Local Business Rate Income for 2019/20

9.1 Councillor Rennison introduced the report setting out the calculation for 2019/20 Council Taxbase and Local Business Rates income as required by law. The following four key areas within the report were highlighted:

1. The Council Tax Base for 2019/20 would be 72,552 B and D properties adjusted for non- collection. This represented an estimated collection rate of 95%
2. Introduction of the 100% Council Tax Empty Property Premium on properties empty for two years or more
3. Business rate income of £145,674,832 would now be split 75% and 25% to Hackney Council (including GLA) and the Government respectively.
4. The current Council Tax Reduction scheme remained unchanged

Members voted on the recommendations as follows:

For: 47 Councillors
Against: 2 Councillors Steinberger and Odze
Abstain: 0

RESOLVED:

1 That in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by Hackney Council as its Council Tax Base for 2019/20 shall be 72,552 Band D equivalent properties adjusted for non- collection. This represents an estimated collection rate of 95.0%.

2 That in accordance with The Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention) Regulations 2013 Hackney's non-domestic rating income for 2019/20 is £145,674,832 subject to completion of the NDR1. This comprises three elements.

- **£40,105,924 which is payable in agreed instalments to the Greater London Authority**
- **£75,309,327 which is retained by Hackney Council and included as part of its resources when calculating the 2018/19 Council Tax requirement.**
- **£30,259,581 which is payable in agreed instalments to Central Government**

3 No changes are made to the current CTRS scheme in 2019/20.

4 The Council Tax Empty Property Premium on properties that have been empty for 2 years or more is increased from 50% to 100%.

10 Report of the Chief Executive: Amendment to the Members' Allowances Scheme 2018/19

10.1 Tim Shields introduced the report, referring Council to the report of Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL.

RESOLVED to agree the report and the amended Members' Allowances Scheme for 2018/19 attached at Appendix 2.

11 Report of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission: Investigation into segregated cycle lanes

11.1 Councillor Patrick introduced the report outlining the recommendations. She thanked the Commission's Members and officers for their work on the project.

11.2 Councillor Stops stated that well designed cycle lanes infrastructure was a challenge as cyclists had different needs as well as taking into consideration other road users including bus users and pedestrians. In addition, there were over 1,000 registered blind people on the streets and cycle lanes needed to be compatible for all road users and therefore it was necessary to outline a criteria for cycle lanes. Councillor Hercock added that well designed cycle lanes and good cycle infrastructure was necessary.

11.3 Councillor Odze indicated that the proposal for segregated cycle lanes was not feasible, dangerous for pedestrians and if implemented would be wasteful. Referring to recommendation four, it was emphasised that signalled crossings would be ineffective until cyclists stopped ignoring red lights and cycling illegally on pavements and until the police were given the powers to take cyclists' registration details. Councillor Odze highlighted that cyclists using cycle lanes in Tower Hamlets ignored road rules making the roads dangerous and unsafe for pedestrians, especially pedestrians alighting buses.

11.4 The Council had been proposing to introduce a segregated cycle lane along West Bank, which had very low traffic and did not require a cycle lane. The proposal included the removal of a whole strip of parking in an area where parking was at a premium and if the cycle lane was introduced in West Bank this would lead to violent demonstrations outside the Town Hall and riots on the streets.

11.5 Councillor Rathbone thanked the Chair and Tom Thorne, the Scrutiny Officer for his work on the Commission's project and further demonstrated how Scrutiny Commissions were effective in getting the Executive to take action. He welcomed the Wick Road scheme review.

11.6 Councillor Lufkin thanked Deputy Mayor Demirci for her work as Cabinet Member and emphasised that separate cycle lanes were necessary to make the roads safer for cyclists and to avoid the dangerous collisions between cyclist and HGV on roads.

11.7 Deputy Mayor Demirci responded that cars were a danger to the borough's residents and across London, and that hundreds of people had been killed on the streets by motorists and not cyclists. She had been proud to have overseen the transformation in the borough and the increase in cycling and cycle lanes over the

previous ten years. Hackney was one of the best cycling boroughs in London and the Council wanted to maintain this in to the future.

RESOLVED to note the Commission's report and the response to it from the Executive.

12 Motion

Councillor Nicholson proposed the Motion
Councillor Wrout seconded the Motion

12.1 Councillor Nicholson introduced the motion. He referred to the twists and turns of Brexit over the past two and a half years and in particular the past four/five months, with Parliamentarians trying to find a consensus to take the country forward. He said that the main thrust of the motion was to recognise what the Council was doing in relation to Brexit and the position that it was being placed in. He said that on a macro level this related to the implications of there being 'no deal' and the impact on the supply chains, and the Council's ability to access a skilled, experienced workforce, able to deliver services. Equally as important was how the Council supported the 4000 residents who were EU citizens living in the borough, their rights and status and their ability to remain part of the community. He emphasised that the Council must rightly focus on this and over the coming months and years be positioned well so that those in need of advice could access this. He said that this was reflected in the Council's relationship with local businesses, stressing that businesses in the Borough had a global reach. Business in the south of the borough interacted and traded globally, creating extraordinary prosperity and economic activity. Wherever you went in the Borough, he said, whether it be Hackney Wick or Stamford Hill, businesses were trading around the world. He said that leaving the EU would impact on these businesses as much as it did on individual citizens and their rights. He referred to the fact that the Prime Minister had decided to abolish the fee of £65 for those European citizens wishing to stay in the country after Brexit, and his embarrassment at the decision to impose this charge. He confirmed that the HM Government would now cover these charges. He referred to the 'extraordinary' shift across all parties to find a centre ground and that Hackney Council accommodated this centre ground, representing where it really mattered, community at local level. He said that if Council supported the motion, the Mayor would be able to go forward and present a clear position and message to all of those involved in the debate on the position that Hackney had taken. The Council would be in a position where it too could unite communities in Hackney and elsewhere in the country. Councillor Nicholson stated that Brexit had left an alarming legacy in the country and that at local level Local Authorities could reach out and connect with each other to take the country forward. This motion, he said, was about positioning the Council as a political entity on behalf of residents, local business, local economy and the borough's prosperity and wellbeing. Councillor Nicholson moved the motion.

12.2 Mayor Glanville supported the motion. He stated that the country had a Prime Minister using 'no deal' as a threat to get votes for her bad deal, an arbitrary date set, and article 50 passed before there even was a plan. A referendum had been called to silence Tory backbenchers, who were now in the driving seat of the Government's plan. He said that Brexit, from end to end, was one great big Tory nightmare, which everyone was having to live with. The bigger disaster than this Government was the cliff edge the Conservatives were about to drive the country off. That was a 'no deal'.

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

He told Council that leaving the EU with no deal would be a disaster for the country, London, and Hackney residents and those from other EU member states.

12.3 Mayor Glanville went on to say that the Bank of England had warned that a no deal Brexit would result in an economic crash worse than 2008, with unemployment rising to 7.5% and GDP falling by 8% in a year. A public sector funding crisis greater than the current austerity agenda would loom and it would throw the borough's residents from other EU member states into limbo as their future in the borough, and country, became uncertain. He said that the Prime Minister had finally demonstrated some compassion and respect for the millions of EU citizens from other member states living in the UK by scrapping the £65 settlement fee. He told Council that for many this was too little, far too late and that in Hackney agreement had been given to reimbursing this amount. People no longer felt welcome here, he said, and were disillusioned with the Government and felt this was not the welcoming, tolerant and progressive country they thought it was. He considered that most decent people wouldn't have dreamed of forcing those who had made Britain their home for years and done so much to enrich it culturally and economically, to jump through hoops to demonstrate that they deserved to stay and then pay £65 for the privilege. He said that this was not a decent government, as was evidenced by 'Windrush' and this attack on EU nationals.

12.4 Mayor Glanville said that while the Government had been busy fighting amongst themselves, Councils had been getting on with the job. He was pleased to see the motion praise the Council for its work since the referendum in 2016. The Council had taken a wide range of steps to support and inform its residents, businesses and staff about the potential impact of Brexit and their rights. One advice session, held in collaboration with the EU Commission was streamed on Facebook and had 38,000 views, a clear illustration that people were desperate for information and guidance. The Council was carrying out work, locally and on a pan-London level, to mitigate disruption to services and was preparing for changes to a range of UK laws and regulatory regimes. Ministers had been written to, expressing concerns and calling for greater support for EU citizens and, this week, a motion had been tabled, opposing a 'no deal Brexit' which would damage the borough's economy and public services. The Council had also taken every opportunity to tell the borough's EU citizens how much they were valued. In 2017 the Council launched the #HackneyLovesYou campaign and encouraged people to share and celebrate the contributions EU nationals made to Hackney life, contributions that would be lost in the face of no deal.

12.5 Mayor Glanville told Council that this week Labour, in opposition, had been at the forefront of opposing no deal, setting red lines for engagement with Government, refusing Theresa May's offer for "cross-party" talks, which was clearly a stunt. Labour was standing firmly against no deal. He said that the Prime Minister remained locked into a prison of her own creating. He hoped all in the Council would stand against the threats and against the blackmail. He considered that it was also clear that no deal could be the only outcome from a Parliament in deadlock, with no party having an outright majority, and even the governing party having no majority in their own ranks for their deal. He said that the Prime Minister may have scraped through a vote of confidence in Parliament, but the Tories had not won the public's confidence in their approach to Brexit. Polls showed that public opinion was strongly against Theresa May's deal. More concerning were the polls that showed that 61% of the public thought the UK was in crisis. He considered that the Brexit process was in crisis, one that could only be solved by a Labour government in power with a majority, and a People's Vote. He confirmed that the Labour's policy passed at Conference stated: "If

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

the Government is confident in negotiating a deal that working people, our economy and communities will benefit from they should not be afraid to put that deal to the public.” He believed that the people should get a choice on Brexit, now that they knew what they were getting. The same principle that Trade Unions use when negotiating with an employer.

12.6 Mayor Glanville believed that there was no left-wing Brexit. He believed that there was no Brexit that benefited working people more than it harmed them. Brexit would establish another hard border to European countries, damage the economy, cause unemployment, and damage the public funds available for vital services. As a Council reliant on business rates for revenue, a damaged economy and a flight or closing of businesses in the borough would hit Hackney Council particularly hard.

12.7 Mayor Glanville agreed that the EU was not perfect, but that European socialists needed solidarity, not our isolation. The motion was about giving the power back to the people, for everyone to have their say. He confirmed that this was why he would be supporting the motion, as it confirmed that the Council would use whatever mouthpiece it had, joining other Councils across the country, in demanding for better, demanding that Britain’s values of openness and tolerance are recognised, and fighting for the people’s right to decide the countries future. The Mayor concluded by asking councillors to vote for this motion.

12.8 Councillor Steinberger told Council that he had voted to remain in the referendum. He said that the Labour Party wanted a general election and that this related to Government and should not be debated in Council. He said that a majority of the people had voted to leave the EU, and that the Council should respect that majority. He stated that the motion did not make sense, and was undemocratic. He submitted that Council had to understand what a no-deal Brexit was before bringing a motion saying that Council shouldn’t support it.

12.9 Councillor Pallis told Council that his family came to England over 100 years ago. Many welcomed them. Many did not. They found a home in the East End and later Hackney. He said that those, like Theresa May, who say that leaving EU would end the debate on immigration were wrong. After 1968 it did not end the debate and the hostile environment policies stoked tensions and did nothing to unify the country. He said that Theresa May’s obsession with immigration had given licence and credibility to arguments that should have stayed in the 19th century, adding that, in Hackney, there was a proud history of welcoming successive waves of migrants, from the Huguenots to the Windrush generation. He said that society should not succumb to Theresa May’s rhetoric on immigration, considering that it led the country down a moribund road from which it could not emerge. The only way was to change the narrative by celebrating immigration, presenting a radical economic message that would speak to those left behind. He said that he did not dismiss those who voted leave, however there was a need to consider the cause of Brexit which went back to the policies of a Thatcher Government. He said that Brexit was a symptom of this not a cause. The cause was post-industrialisation. He said the future was not in Brexit. There were two burning issues of our epoque, future work and climate change and that a huge environmental crisis was being faced. He told Council that Bangladesh was predicted to be under water by the end of the century. He said that the debate on immigration would not go away and that there was a need for a radical labour government who could deliver a new political settlement to meet these challenges, leading a socialist Europe. This could only be achieved, he said by remaining in the EU. He took hope from Windrush and Europe and supported the motion.

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

12.10 Councillor Sharman told Council that he wholeheartedly supported the motion. He said that Hackney was deeply affected by the Brexit debate and responded to Councillor Steinberger that this was not a theoretical, national or international matter with no relevance to Hackney. He referred to the fact that thousands of fellow citizens were feeling insecure, with an impact on jobs and services. He said that the Council had a responsibility to ensure that voices were heard alongside others in the country and considered that it was important to see Brexit as a local issue. He considered that this was the most divisive issue of our times, splitting parties, communities and families and that this would not end on 29 March 2019 but would cause social tension for many years. He said that people had to be part of the answer, stressing the need for well-informed discussion. He was delighted to support the Mayor's initiatives but considered that the Council must go further with community debates, citizen juries and small group discussion. The experience from the peace process in Northern Ireland and the abortion referendum in Southern Ireland could be drawn on. He considered that deeply divided communities could be brought together, that the Council had a leadership role and needed to play its part in ensuring that the debate continues.

12.11 Councillor Hercocock stated that Britain still remained in the EU and that the vote in 2016 was based on a misconception of what the EU is and does. He said that the country was on the brink of making a tragic mistake. He referred to the Treaty of Rome, 12 years after the second world-war, describing the aims of the organisation that would go on to be the EU - economic and social progress of European people's lives and better living and working conditions, etc. He said that the EU had not always lived up to this but asked if people should give up on it and the practical benefits of cooperation with its closest neighbours who were some of the fairest and freest countries in the world. He referred to the fact that there was considerable evidence that many who had voted to leave had changed their mind, realising the cost of leaving the EU and the lies they were told in the process by a distant elite who shared a different vision of the future with shared prosperity. He considered that it was not too late and asked that this matter be referred back to the people and that the opportunity not to make this mistake be grasped. He said another Europe was possible and another future was possible.

12.12 Councillor Wrout stated that there was a free vote on this matter and welcomed this. She referred to the fact that she was proud that Hackney had a national and international reputation for being a friendly home to migrants and those from further afield. She deplored the anti-immigrant feeling whipped up during the referendum, a feeling emanating from the Government's austerity measures. She said that a labour government could offer a welfare net, a fair days pay and services that functioned for everybody with the resultant disappearance of the whole debate. She had no confidence in the safety measures of the Government and that it could be judged on the state of the railways, the disaster of universal credit, etc. It was vital, she said to rule out 'a no deal Brexit'. She considered it outrageous for the Prime Minister to say that a second vote would split the country given the impact of the 2016 referendum, called solely for Conservative Party political reasons. She understood that there was little appetite for a second referendum but cited the example of Switzerland where there were many referendums and a clarifying vote was not uncommon. Councillor Wrout considered that a second vote should be an option. Further, there was a need to show EU citizens and all migrants in the borough what the Council had done for them and that the Council would stand with them whatever happened. Councillor Wrout urged Councillors to support the motion.

12.13 Councillor Odze told Council that he agreed that the safety and wellbeing of EU residents of the borough and the need to support the borough's EU residents were

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

important issues but that had had nothing to do with the motion. He said that in 2016 David Cameron had gone to the country to ask if they wanted to remain in the most corrupt organisation in the world. He opposed the motion and stated that he supported a “no deal Brexit.”

12.14 Councillor Etti told Council that the Borough of Hackney had the 2nd highest vote percentage to remain in the EU. She said that she was proud of Hackney and its diversity and the strength of that diversity and that it was the Council’s responsibility to support the motion.

13.15 Councillor Moema referred to the impact of Brexit on local business and asked whether representatives had been involved in the SEG Scrutiny Commission. She referred to the misery of the immigration process, having had family experience, which she considered not fit for purpose.

13.16 Councillor Snell referred to Brexit as a misinformed decision based on lies. He had lost friends through Brexit and had now visited most countries of Europe where he had not heard negative comments about the EU. He considered that racism was at the basis of Brexit. Councillor Snell supported the motion.

13.17 Councillor Rathbone referred to the importance of this issue of council cuts and Brexit from an article in the Hackney Gazette. This Government had been slashing funding in housing, health and social care since 2010 and although Brexit was an important issue inequality and poverty were significant issues.

13.18 Councillor Desmond referred to the pride of hosting the Olympics in 2012 and wondered what had happened to the country which had become a laughing stock. He said that democracy was a moving escalator and that now that the people had the facts on Brexit they should have the opportunity to vote again on Brexit.

13.19 Councillor Race referred to the waste of time, money and effort involved in Brexit. He stated that austerity continued for residents of Hackney while 5 billion pounds had been allocated to no deal planning alone and asked what work could have been done in Hackney with such amounts. He referred to the fact that the country had voted narrowly to leave the EU.

13.20 Councillor Cameron said she stood in solidarity with other Councillors and stressed that the people deserved to have another vote on Brexit. She said that democracy kept moving, that 80 percent of the Hackney population had voted in favour of remaining the EU and if the vote was taken again the figure would be higher. She referred to the high remain vote in the Clissold Ward and that many residents in this part of the borough were European and that they had asked her to write to ministers asking for a second vote. She said that there was a need to rule out a ‘no deal Brexit’.

RESOLVED:

Hackney Council celebrates the borough’s long history of being a diverse and inclusive place, which remains proudly outward looking and internationalist, welcoming refugees and migrants from all over the world, including the European Union. The borough has been enriched culturally, economically and socially by migrants who have made Hackney their home.

Hackney Council welcomes that Hackney had the second highest Remain vote in the UK (after Lambeth), with 78.5% of people voting to stay in the EU.

Hackney Council notes that cultural diversity is integral to our community and our way of life and that around 15% of our citizens, 41,500 residents are EU citizens from other member states. These European citizens help sustain our public services and make an enormous contribution to the civic, economic and cultural life of this borough.

Hackney Council acknowledges the negative impact that the uncertainty caused by Brexit poses to the local economy and public services in Hackney, already damaged by austerity, as well as EU citizens from other member states who are residents of Hackney.

Hackney Council expresses its concern that a Parliament in deadlock, thanks to no Party having an outright majority, is being forced into choosing between a 'bad deal' or a 'no deal Brexit' by the Prime Minister and this Government.

Hackney Council is concerned with the impact that no deal could have on our borough and this Council, its workforce and its capacity to deliver services for its residents and businesses.

This motion recognises the work Hackney Council has undertaken to plan ahead in an attempt to ensure service continuity and provide reassurance and support for Council employees, residents and businesses at a time of great national uncertainty.

This includes:

- Creating the 'Hackney Loves You' campaign to recognise the contribution of EU citizens from other member states to Hackney.
- Communicating with EU residents about how they can get advice and support about their status, including holding an open meeting with the support of the EU Commission.
- Supporting and signposting employees of the Council who are EU citizens from other member states to advice on citizenship rights and the application procedures required to remain in the UK post March 2019.
- Covering the cost of the settled status fee for Council employees.
- Signposting local businesses to advice on international trade, employment rights and regulatory requirements post March 2019.
- Ensuring the Council's existing supply chains suffer minimal disruption and that the Council can respond swiftly and adeptly to changing supply chains post March 2019.
- Preparing for changes in the lead up to and post March 2019 to a range of UK law and regulatory regimes which are currently governed by the EU.

The Council firmly rejects a 'no deal Brexit' which will not just affect the Council's ability to provide services but it will also affect the borough's local economy and the wellbeing and prosperity of residents, both EU and UK citizens, living in the borough.

Those who champion the UK crashing out of the European Union still remain silent about what their alternative will offer other than to call on UK businesses to trade on World Trade Organisation rules. It has been shown that trading under these rules

Wednesday, 23rd January, 2019

would weaken the UK economy, forcing entirely avoidable hardship upon millions of struggling families, individuals and businesses.

Hackney Council therefore supports the call on the Prime Minister and her Government to rule out a 'no deal Brexit' and be prepared to extend Article 50 to avoid the UK crashing out with 'no deal', and supports the right of Parliament to stop such a 'no deal' scenario.

Hackney Council supports this action as a first credible step in achieving the call for a General Election or ensuring enough time is given for all options, including campaigning for a public or 'people's vote', with a clear option to remain in the EU, on the table. Council believes this would resolve the current political deadlock and provide the democratic endorsement, or not, of a final deal.

The Council believes this is necessary to safeguard the wellbeing and prosperity of the residents and businesses of our borough.

The Council reiterates our support for Hackney's EU residents from other member states, and would ask the Mayor and administration to communicate the substance and adoption of this motion to the Government, local residents and businesses.

In Favour: Many
Abstentions: 5
Against: 2

13 Appointments to Commissions/Committees - Commission Membership - Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission, Committee Membership, Licensing Committee

The Speaker introduced the report and requested approval of the proposed appointments.

RESOLVED to:

- 1. Approve the appointment of Councillor Wrouth to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.**
- 2. Approve the appointment of Councillor Wrouth to the Licensing Committee to fill the current vacancy.**

Duration of the meeting: 19.00 – 22.10 hours

APPENDIX - RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Q5. Question from Councillor Patrick to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs:

What effect is universal credit having on the residents of Hackney? What has the council put in place to assist residents who are struggling?

Universal Credit (UC) replaces six working age means tested benefits and is the biggest change in recent years to the benefits system.

Hackney was expected to move to Full Service in June 2018. That was later pushed back to October 2018. This means all new claimants, or claimants reporting a change in circumstances, will have to access Universal Credit through the digital route. I am pleased to announce that in recognition of the woeful inadequacy of the service being provided to those seeking to claim Universal Credit and the impact it is having on individual's income and debt levels, the Government has now postponed moving existing claimants across to Universal Credit until 2020 at the earliest.

It is very early stages to make an assessment of how the roll-out of Universal Credit is going in Hackney. Early feedback from JCP is that around 88% of UC claims which were completed in October were paid on time. A key reason for delay in payment is verifying housing costs for which we have developed strong links with JCP and have joined the Landlord Portal to make claims quicker to verify.

Hackney has the largest housing benefit caseload in London and we have been working hard preparing residents for its impact, including:

- Supporting residents with clear information provided through the Hackney website, Hackney Today, direct communications to residents more likely to be affected and engagement at community events such as Hackney carnival.
- Writing to all working-age Council tenants in the Borough who are ending a Housing Benefit claim to advise them that UC is coming and to explain what this would mean if they had to make a new claim after October 2018.
- Establishing a Hackney UC Steering Group through the existing Welfare Reform Working Group, bringing together key departments and partners (including DWP colleagues) to coordinate our joint approach.
- Training front line staff on Universal Credit and how to support residents.
- The housing team are identifying potentially vulnerable customers and making personal contact with them to ensure they understand UC and its implications.
- Ensuring that where appropriate a direct Alternative Payment Arrangement is put in place for the housing cost element.
- Localised personal budgeting and digital support is commissioned through DWP and CAB 'Help to Claim' service commenced in January as a pilot prior to the full national roll-out of a nationally commissioned service.
- And we have ring fenced advice services funding to ensure the voluntary and community sector is able to offer residents support.

We have written to the respective Secretary of State on two separate occasions highlighting the detrimental impact Universal Credit will have on Hackney residents, particularly with regards to the need to consider how a benefit available only online or over the phone risks discriminating against those who choose not to access the internet for religious reasons, something I know Cllr Klein has also raised. Despite this no substantive changes have been made to the digital by default approach. I understand that DWP officials have recently met with representatives from the Orthodox Jewish community including from Hackney. It would have been helpful if such discussions could have taken place prior to the roll-out of UC nationally given the specific needs of the community which need to be understood as well other communities in the Borough.

We will continue to work to support residents to manage the migration to Universal Credit and continue to lobby for changes to Universal Credit, such as reducing the five week wait to a more manageable period and ensuring that it does make work pay as originally intended in its design. We remain very concerned that UC could push more residents into poverty and destitution, increasing reliance on emergency support including food banks as evidenced in early roll-out areas as well evidence that UC claimants are more likely to be in rent arrears compared to residents on Housing Benefit. We will monitor the situation closely and work to support residents where we can who are facing hardship due to Universal Credit.

Q6. Question from Councillor Race to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care:

The Cabinet member will have noted media coverage of a case in which a man found guilty of rape sought access to his child through the local council's care services. Can the cabinet member confirm that Hackney Council has strict policies in place that, while complying with the law, have a bias against putting children and women in a situation whereby they are contacted by the perpetrator of a crime such as this?

The case in the media on 28th November 2018 was in relation to Rotherham Council having contacted a child's father to share notification of court proceedings. The coverage rightly highlighted the detrimental impact of this upon the child's mother who had experienced systematic rape and sexual exploitation by the father.

The law in England is very clear that all parents, regardless of parental responsibility, should be given notice of care proceedings in relation to their child by the Local Authority. A Local Authority can however make an application to the court for an exceptional order to avoid notifying a parent about care proceedings. While there is no guarantee that that such an order would be granted by the court, Hackney Children and Families Service would certainly do so in cases such as this where a child was conceived as a result of rape, unless there were very compelling reasons for not doing so.

When considering any contact arrangements for a child, each case needs to be considered individually. Hackney Children and Families Service would always act in the best interest of the child, ensuring that all necessary safeguarding measures are in place.

Q7. Question from Councillor Hercock to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Business and Investment:

What can the council do for the residents of Denman Court who have historically been able to access Church St via Barn Street but who are no longer able to do so since the development of new houses on Barn Street included a gated fence?

Planning permission (ref. 2012/3330) was issued on 1 March 2013 for the erection of two buildings to provide nine residential units on land south of Denman House, Barn Street. No fence (preventing public access to Barn Street) was proposed as part of the application, and no further application has since been submitted.

In principle, access from Barn St to Denman House should remain open. In 3.1 of the developers access statement which they submitted alongside their planning application, they said:

“The development proposes a pedestrianised pathway opening up Barn Street to Denman House. The path is inaccessible to cars and will have a gate on the Barn Street end for added security.”

In 3.7 of their planning statement they also state: “A key part of the proposal is to open a pedestrian path from Barn Street to Denman House. This will make the area more accessible for residents and the active street frontage will give natural surveillance and a safer neighbourhood.”

Inaccessibility between Barn St and Denman House should not happen according to the principles of the planning application. The Planning Service has not received any recent complaints regarding a fence, but have asked Planning Officers to investigate the issue, investigate all available options accordingly, and get back to you about any further action required.

More broadly, the Planning Enforcement team receives an average of 50 new enforcement complaints each month, with over 90% of those complaints swiftly leading to a site visit within 10 working days. For over than 3 years now more investigations have been completed and resolved each quarter than new complaints received, with the vast majority of investigations of confirmed breaches of planning control resulting in a fully remedy of the breach. We have a robust approach to enforcement, and the team have resolved 490 enforcement complaints so far in 18/19 since 1 April.

Q8. Question from Councillor Stops to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Transport and Parks:

The council has proposed a novel cycle scheme for the Balls Pond Road. However, members and residents would not have been aware of the full details of the scheme because the details were either not available or not known. Members and residents will not have known that it is proposed to introduce rubber blocks and plastic bollards into the carriageway, because the consultation said nothing of this. They would not have known the Kingsbury Road junction details, because the detailed design is not available. Bus passengers would not have known of the delays expected for buses, because nobody appears to have considered this.

Can the consultation be re-run with these details included?

- The purpose of the recent consultation which started on the 23 November and ended on the 21 December 2018, was to highlight the proposals to local residents in particular, given that the original consultation was undertaken in February 2015 and people may either have forgotten it, or may have moved into the area subsequent to that consultation.
- Officers wanted to ensure that residents were aware of the proposed changes to the kerbside controls in particular, along with the proposed banned right turn into Culford Road and the removal of the banned right turn into Southgate Road. It was also publicly available on the Council's website.
- Over 400 residents engaged with the consultation, and 67% supported the proposals. Once again, Hackney Council has gone above and beyond our statutory duty to consult with residents, and ensure they fully understand the work the Council is doing to make their roads safer and cleaner.
- The Greenwich Wand orca -- or 'plastic bollards' -- offers vertical and horizontal measures integrated into one product, and is ideal for segregation over longer distances.
- The product is already in use in various local authorities and can be spaced to allow for cleaning vehicles to access the cycle lane.
- It is worth noting that the materials have been chosen so that they can easily be removed in the event of a blockage adjacent to the proposed cycle lane i.e. utilities may need to provide a new service to one of the properties. This would mitigate against the potential need for major bus and traffic diversions.
- London Bus representatives are included as key stakeholders on all Streetscene consultations. They would therefore have been consulted (at a minimum) both during the 2015 and the recent consultation. We have had no objections from them. Bus delays would be similar to the introduction of any new traffic signals -- in this case, the main aim of the scheme was the safety of cyclists.

Scheme Background

In February 2015 TfL in partnership with Hackney Council consulted on the CS1 route which included two options for Balls Pond Road: an option for advisory cycle lanes on each side of the road and an option for a two-way segregated cycle track. Supportive responses to the consultation were received for the segregated two-way cycle track on the north side of Balls Pond Road.

Following on from residents and users of the CS1 route feedback, Hackney Council reviewed the route and the current scheme to propose a safe crossing point for cyclists across Balls Pond Road at the junction with Culford Road.

This scheme aims to resolve what is a missing link for safe cycling on the CS1 route.

Consultation

The stakeholder and public consultation started on the 23 November and ended on the 21 December 2018. The table below provides a summary of the overall consultation results.

Freepost Replies - 141

Support	Oppose	Don't know
71 (50%)	63 (44%)	7 (6%)

On-line Replies – 272

Support	Oppose	Don't know
207	60	5

Segregation Material - Greenwich Wand Orca

The Greenwich Wand orca offers vertical and horizontal measures integrated into one product. The product combines vertical Jislon Pole cones with reflective TSRGD compliant marking, with horizontal rubber modules. This product is ideal for segregation over longer distances where vehicle speed are higher (Balls Pond Road 85% speeds eastbound – 24.8mph and westbound 23.2mph).

The product is already in use in various local authorities and can be spaced to allow for cleaning vehicles to access the cycle lane.



Kingsbury Road Junction Details

Amendments have been made to the initial design to help with the interactions of cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles at the junction with Kingsbury Road. (Please see attached drawing). These details are frequently developed further following public consultations.

Disruption to Buses

This concern will be monitored together with London Buses and, if required, further action can be taken to mitigate bus journey delays such as moving the existing bus stop further west along Balls Pond Road. Any delays caused as a consequence of a new signal junction, which assists more vulnerable road users, have to be balanced against the improved safety for cyclists and pedestrians at this location, noting that some of the delays will effectively be mitigated in the sense that delays will already be caused when the existing pedestrian crossing is called (accepting that this is not every cycle). London Buses were consulted as part of the stakeholder consultation exercise and did not raise any concerns.

Additional Information

Accident History

Ø There have been 4 accidents over a three year period along Balls Pond Road between the junctions of Culford Road and Kingsbury Road. Three of these accidents involved a cyclist, with 1 serious and 2 slight personal injuries.

Existing Carriageway

Ø The existing road surface is in poor condition together with ponding in a number of locations. Funding has been secured as part of this scheme to complete carriageway resurfacing and improve existing surface water drainage facilities along this section of Balls Pond Road, which will improve journeys for all road users especially for cyclist. At the present time TfL does not fund surfacing on principal roads.